



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/576,467	12/13/2006	Roland Edelmann	289261US0PCT	7208
22850	7590	11/25/2009	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			YAGER, JAMES C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1794	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/25/2009	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com  
oblonpat@oblon.com  
jgardner@oblon.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/576,467	<b>Applicant(s)</b> EDELMANN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> JAMES YAGER	<b>Art Unit</b> 1794	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 August 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 15-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 15-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                    | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. The amendment filed 06 August 2009 has been entered. Claims 1-10 and 15-20 are currently pending in the application. The rejections of record from the office action dated 06 April 2009 not repeated herein have been withdrawn.

### ***Election/Restrictions***

2. Newly submitted claims 15-20 are directed to an invention that lacks unity with the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: Claims 15-20 are directed to packaging materials and composite structures, while the elected invention is directed to a composition.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 15-20 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

***Claim Objections***

3. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: To avoid confusion in the scope of the claims, it is suggested that (i)-(iv) are specifically recited. For example, "(i) at least one organoalkoxysilane..." in place of "component (i)". Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. There does not appear to be support to recite "organoalkoxysilane having organofunctionality comprising". It is not clear what, if any difference there is between "displays" and "comprising". Clarification is requested. There does not appear to be support to recite that the "component (i) comprises"; "component (ii) comprises"; "component (iii) comprises"; "component (iv) comprises"; "component (v) comprises"; "organic solvent comprises" (claims 2-4 and 6-8) given

Art Unit: 1794

that the use of the language "comprising" broadens the scope of the components to encompass additional components.

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 6 and 7, the term "employed" renders the claim indefinite because it is not clear what is meant by this term.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

10. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

11. Claims 1-5 and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nanavati (WO 01/66655) in view of Wyman (US 5,077,135).

Regarding claims 1-5 and 8-10, Nanavati discloses a coating composition having barrier properties (i.e. barrier layer) (P1/L5-10), comprising N-(2-aminoethyl)-3-aminopropyltrimethoxy silane (i.e. (ii) at least one aminoalkylalkoxysilane; N-(2-aminoethyl)-3-aminopropyltrimethoxy silane) (P4/L7-10), pyrogallol (i.e. (iii) at least one polyol; aromatic polyol; pyrogallol) (P6/L6-10), reacted in a solvent such as methanol in an amount of 1% to about 99% of the composition (i.e. reaction products produced under hydrolysis conditions (vi) organic solvent; aliphatic alcohol) (P6/L10-20), further comprising a photoinitiator (i.e. which comprises photoinitiator) (P8/L25-30).

Nanavati does not disclose (i) at least one organoalkoxysilane having organofunctionality comprising at least one unsaturated hydrocarbon group; or that the molar ratio of (i) : (ii) : (iii) is (i) = 1 and (ii) = from 0.5 to 1.5, and (iii) = from 0.3 to 1.1.

Wyman discloses a coating for improving gas impermeability (i.e. a barrier layer) (C2/L1-5), comprising vinyl triethoxy silane (i.e. (i) at least one organoalkoxysilane having organofunctionality comprising at least one unsaturated hydrocarbon group; vinyltriethoxysilane) (C6/L60-65). Wyman further discloses that the coating is smooth and uniform (C6/L65-68), therefore having improved barrier properties (C3/L42-50).

Nanavati and Wyman are analogous art because they both teach about barrier layers. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the vinyl triethoxy silane of Wyman in the coating composition of Nanavati to provide a coating composition wherein the coating is smooth and uniform, therefore having improved barrier properties.

Given that the solvent is present in an amount of 1% to 99%, it is the examiner's position that the solids content of the composition would be from 1% to 99% which clearly overlaps the instantly claimed range of 10 to 60% by weight solids.

Neither Nanavati nor Wyman disclose that the molar ratio of (i) : (ii) : (iii) is (i) = 1 and (ii) = from 0.5 to 1.5, and (iii) = from 0.3 to 1.1. However, when faced with a mixture, one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated by common sense to select a 1:1 ratio, a ratio that falls within the presently claimed amount, absent evidence of unexpected or surprising results. Case law holds that "[h]aving established that this knowledge was in the art, the examiner could then properly rely... on a conclusion of obviousness, 'from common knowledge and common sense of the person of ordinary skill in the art within any specific hint or suggestion in a particular reference.'" *In re Bozek*, 416 F.2d 1385, 1390, 163 USPQ 545, 549 (CCPA 1969).

Art Unit: 1794

12. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nanavati (WO 01/66655) in view of Wyman (US 5,077,135), as applied to claim 1 above, in further view of Ichikawa et al. (US 4,735,832) or Komada (US 2001/0038894).

Regarding claim 6, modified Nanavati discloses all of the claim limitations as set forth above. Modified Nanavati does not disclose that the composition employs a component (iv) comprising at least one member selected from the group consisting of tetraethoxysilane, oligomeric tetraalkoxysilane, propyltrimethoxysilane, propyltriethoxysilane, octyltrimethoxysilane, octyltriethoxysilane, alcoholic and or aqueous compositions of oligomeric cocondensates composed of aminoalkylalkoxysilanes and of fluoroalkylalkoxysilanes and also oligomeric condensates or cocondensates composed of alkylalkoxysilanes, and also oligomeric condensates or cocondensates composed of alkylalkoxysilanes and/or or vinylalkoxysilanes.

Ichikawa discloses a coating having a gas barrier characteristic comprising low permeability to oxygen and carbon dioxide (i.e. barrier layer) (C3/L55-60), comprising a composition comprising organoalkoxy silanes such as tetraethoxy silane (i.e. (iv) at least one member selected from the group consisting of tetraethoxysilane) (C9/L10-20).

Nanavati, Wyman and Ichikawa are analogous art because they both teach about barrier layers. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the composition comprising tetraethoxy silane of Ichikawa into the composition of modified Nanavati to provide a



Art Unit: 1794

coating with further improved gas barrier characteristics such as low permeability to oxygen and carbon dioxide.

Komada discloses a gas barrier film (i.e. a barrier layer) ([0001]), comprising tetraethoxysilane ([0140]-[0143]). Komada discloses that the film has improved barrier properties ([0143]).

Nanavati, Wyman and Komada are analogous art because they both teach about barrier layers. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the tetraethoxysilane of Komada into the composition of modified Nanavati to provide a coating with further improved gas barrier characteristics.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nanavati (WO 01/66655) in view of Wyman (US 5,077,135), as applied to claim 1 above, in further view of Huffer et al. (US 2002/0146525).

Regarding claim 7, modified Nanavati discloses all of the claim limitations as set forth above. Modified Nanavati does not disclose that the component (v) is employed and component (v) comprises at least one member selected from the group consisting of precipitated or fumed silica, silicates, aluminum oxides, aluminum oxide hydroxides and aluminum hydroxide.

Huffer discloses a coating as a barrier to oxygen and moisture (i.e. a barrier layer), comprising aluminum oxide ([0034]).

Nanavati, Wyman and Huffer are analogous art because they all teach about barrier layers. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

Art Unit: 1794

the time the invention was made to incorporate the aluminum oxide of Huffer into the composition of modified Nanavati to provide a composition with enhanced barrier properties to oxygen and moisture.

13. Claims 1-5 and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wyman (US 5,077,135) in view of Nanavati (WO 01/66655).

Regarding claims 1-5 and 8-9, Wyman discloses a coating for improving gas impermeability (i.e. a barrier layer) (C2/L1-5), comprising vinyl triethoxy silane (i.e. (i) at least one organoalkoxysilane having organofunctionality comprising at least one unsaturated hydrocarbon group; vinyltriethoxysilane), gamma-aminopropyl tri-ethoxy silane (i.e. (ii) at least one aminoalkylalkoxysilane; 3-aminopropyltrieth-oxysilane) and methanol, subjected to hydrolysis (i.e. reaction products produced under hydrolysis conditions (vi) an organic solvent; aliphatic alcohol) (C6/L58-65; C5/L5-12). Wyman does not disclose (iii) at least one polyol aromatic polyol; pyrogallol, nor a photoinitiator.

Nanavati discloses a coating composition having barrier properties (i.e. barrier layer) (P1/L5-10), comprising N-(2-aminoethyl)-3-aminopropyltrimethoxy silane (i.e. (ii) at least one aminoalkylalkoxysilane) (P4/L7-10), and pyrogallol (i.e. (iii) at least one polyol; aromatic polyol; pyrogallol) (P6/L6-10), further comprising a photoinitiator (i.e. further comprising photoinitiator) (P8/L25-30). Nanavati further discloses that the pyrogallol reacts with the aminofunctional silane forming a complex which provides unique physical properties which are good for barrier coatings (P5/L25-30).

Wyman and Nanavati are analogous art because they both teach about barrier coatings. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

Art Unit: 1794

time the invention was made to incorporate the pyrogallol of Nanavati into the composition of Wyman to provide a composition having unique physical properties which are good for barrier coatings, and to incorporate the photoinitiator of Nanavati into the composition of Wyman to provide a composition that can be cured more rapidly.

Neither Wyman nor Nanavati disclose that the molar ratio of (i) : (ii) : (iii) is (i) = 1 and (ii) = from 0.5 to 1.5, and (iii) = from 0.3 to 1.1. However, when faced with a mixture, one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated by common sense to select a 1:1 ratio, a ratio that falls within the presently claimed amount, absent evidence of unexpected or surprising results. Case law holds that "[h]aving established that this knowledge was in the art, the examiner could then properly rely... on a conclusion of obviousness, 'from common knowledge and common sense of the person of ordinary skill in the art within any specific hint or suggestion in a particular reference.'" *In re Bozek*, 416 F.2d 1385, 1390, 163 USPQ 545, 549 (CCPA 1969).

Regarding claim 10, Wyman discloses that the composition comprises 10ml of a mixture of silanes dissolved in 90 ml of methanol and 1ml of water . Therefore, the quantity of silanes (i.e. solids content) is calculated to be 9.9% (10ml silanes/101ml total). It is apparent, however, that the instantly claimed amount of silanes and that taught by modified Wyman are so close to each other that the fact pattern is similar to the one in In re Woodruff , 919 F.2d 1575, USPQ2d 1934 (Fed. Cir. 1990) or Titanium Metals Corp. of America v. Banner, 778 F.2d 775, 227 USPQ 773 (Fed.Cir. 1985) where despite a "slight" difference in the ranges the court held that such a difference did not "render the claims patentable" or, alternatively, that "a prima facie case of

Art Unit: 1794

obviousness exists where the claimed ranges and prior art ranges do not overlap but are close enough so that one skilled in the art would have expected them to have the same properties”.

In light of the case law cited above and given that there is only a “slight” difference between the amount of silanes disclosed by modified Wyman and the amount disclosed in the present claims and further given the fact that no criticality is disclosed in the present invention with respect to the amount of silanes, it therefore would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the amount of silanes disclosed in the present claims is but an obvious variant of the amounts disclosed in modified Wyman, and thereby one of ordinary skill in the art would have arrived at the claimed invention.

14. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wyman (US 5,077,135) in view of Nanavati (WO 01/66655), as applied to claim 1 above, in further view of Ichikawa et al. (US 4,735,832) or Komada (US 2001/0038894).

Regarding claim 6, modified Wyman discloses all of the claim limitations as set forth above. Modified Wyman does not disclose that the composition employs a component (iv) comprising at least one member selected from the group consisting of tetraethoxysilane, oligomeric tetraalkoxysilane, propyltrimethoxysilane, propyltriethoxysilane, octyltrimethoxysilane, octyltriethoxysilane, alcoholic and or aqueous compositions of oligomeric cocondensates composed of aminoalkylalkoxysilanes and of fluoroalkylalkoxysilanes and also oligomeric condensates or cocondensates composed of alkylalkoxysilanes, and also oligomeric

Art Unit: 1794

condensates or cocondensates composed of alkylalkoxysilanes and/or or vinylalkoxysilanes.

Ichikawa discloses a coating having a gas barrier characteristic comprising low permeability to oxygen and carbon dioxide (i.e. barrier layer) (C3/L55-60), comprising a composition comprising organoalkoxy silanes such as tetraethoxy silane (i.e. (iv) at least one member selected from the group consisting of tetraethoxysilane) (C9/L10-20).

Wyman, Nanavati and Ichikawa are analogous art because they all teach about barrier layers. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the composition comprising tetraethoxy silane of Ichikawa into the composition of modified Wyman to provide a coating with further improved gas barrier characteristics such as low permeability to oxygen and carbon dioxide.

Komada discloses a gas barrier film (i.e. a barrier layer) ([0001]), comprising tetraethoxysilane ([0140]-[0143]). Komada discloses that the film has improved barrier properties ([0143]).

Wyman, Nanavati and Komada are analogous art because they both teach about barrier layers. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the tetraethoxysilane of Komada into the composition of modified Wyman to provide a coating with further improved gas barrier characteristics.

Art Unit: 1794

15. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wyman (US 5,077,135) in view of Nanavati (WO 01/66655), As applied to claim 1 above, in further view of Huffer et al. (US 2002/0146525).

Regarding claim 7, modified Wyman discloses all of the claim limitations as set forth above. Modified Wyman does not disclose that the composition employs a component (v) comprising at least one member selected from the group consisting of precipitated or fumed silica, silicates, aluminum oxides, aluminum oxide hydroxides and aluminum hydroxide.

Huffer discloses a coating as a barrier to oxygen and moisture (i.e. a barrier layer), comprising aluminum oxide ([0034]).

Wyman, Nanavati and Huffer are analogous art because they all teach about barrier layers. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the aluminum oxide of Huffer into the composition of modified Wyman to provide a composition with enhanced barrier properties to oxygen and moisture.

### ***Response to Arguments***

16. Applicant's arguments filed 06 August 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Art Unit: 1794

Applicant argues that there is no motivation to combine Nanavati with Wyman or Wyman with Nanavati and that the motivation constitutes impermissible hindsight reasoning.

As set forth above, Nanavati and Wyman are analogous art because they both teach about barrier layers. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the vinyl triethoxy silane of Wyman in the coating composition of Nanavati to provide a coating composition wherein the coating is smooth and uniform, therefore having improved barrier properties.

Wyman and Nanavati are analogous art because they both teach about barrier coatings. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the pyrogallol of Nanavati into the composition of Wyman to provide a composition having unique physical properties which are good for barrier coatings, and to incorporate the photoinitiator of Nanavati into the composition of Wyman to provide a composition that can be cured more rapidly.

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

Applicant argues that Examiner did not establish that the molar ratio is a result effective variable.

Examiner's position was not that it would have been obvious to choose the molar ratios based on result effective variable reasoning. Rather, it is the examiner's position, as set forth above, that when faced with a mixture, one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated by common sense to select a 1:1 ratio, a ratio that falls within the presently claimed amount, absent evidence of unexpected or surprising results. Case law holds that "[h]aving established that this knowledge was in the art, the examiner could then properly rely... on a conclusion of obviousness, 'from common knowledge and common sense of the person of ordinary skill in the art within any specific hint or suggestion in a particular reference.'" *In re Bozek*, 416 F.2d 1385, 1390, 163 USPQ 545, 549 (CCPA 1969).

Applicant argues that the examples of the present invention demonstrate that compositions that do not include components (i), (ii) and (iii), or that do not include these components in the molar ratio required in claim 1 result in barrier layers with inferior oxygen permeation, therefore showing unexpected results.

First, the cited examples are not commensurate with the scope of the claims given that the examples only show specific components (i), (ii) and (iii) in specific ratios, not the broad components (i), (ii) and (iii) and broad molar ratios recited in the claims.

Second, the cited examples are not commensurate in scope with the closest prior art because none of the comparative examples teach N-(2-aminoethyl)-3-aminopropyltrimethoxy silane or gamma-aminopropyl tri-ethoxy silane.



Third, it is not persuasive because Wyman discloses vinyl triethoxy silane provides a coating having improved barrier properties (C3/L42-50). Therefore, it is not unexpected that the presence of vinyl triethoxy silane would improve the barrier properties.

Fourth, it is not persuasive because Nanavati discloses that the pyrogallol reacts with the aminofunctional silane forming a complex which provides unique physical properties which are good for barrier coatings (P5/L25-30). Therefore, it is not unexpected that the presence of pyrogallol would improve the barrier properties.

### ***Conclusion***

17. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 1794

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JAMES YAGER whose telephone number is (571)270-3880. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri, 7:30am-5pm, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rena Dye can be reached on 571 272-3186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JY 11/14/09

/Rena L. Dye/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1794